

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application has been carefully considered in light of the non-Final Office Action of May 3, 2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 7, 11 and 12 were directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 1-6, and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious and therefore unpatentable over the previously cited references to Klausen when considered in view of the reference to Korene et al. The Examiner's reasons for the rejection are based upon the previous Examiner's outlined rejections in the previous Final Office Action.

Applicants reiterate the argument set forth in response to the previous Final Office Action with respect to the differences between the prior art references and the present invention. More specifically, the primary reference to Klausen is directed to a process for bleaching cellulosic pulp to de-water the pulp as the pulp passes through a screw press. In this respect, the structure of the Klausen reference is particularly designed to allow water to pass outwardly with respect to the screw chamber and thus the screw chamber is not designed to be pressure tight, as is the function of the feeding apparatus of the present invention.

With respect to the structure of the present invention,

claim 1 has been further amended to define that the housing is sealed between the inlet and the outlet and that the inlet is adapted to be connected to the discharge of a steam separator. The reference to Klausen does not disclose a housing which is sealed between the inlet and the outlet but rather discloses a structure which is specifically designed to be opened to allowed passage of water. As such, the structure of Klausen is not believed to be of a type which would be usable to accomplish the objectives for which the feeding apparatus of the present invention was specifically designed. In this respect, the reference does not disclose a structure having the necessary nexus to the present invention to form the basis for an obviousness rejection in combination with the secondary reference to Korene et al.

With respect to the combination rejection, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art of bleaching cellulosic and pulp such as taught in the reference to Klausen would not look to any of the teachings or structure of the reference to Korene et al. to modify the screw press in Klausen. The reference to Korene et al. is directed to an apparatus for mechanically and chemically destroying polysaccharides which includes a screw conveyor mounted within a housing. The device includes a plurality of mechanical blades which are mounted within a chamber

of the housing and the blades are designed so as to grind material composed of peat which has been mixed with concentrated sulphuric acid.

The residence time of the material within the grinding portion of the apparatus is adjusted in order to allow the destruction of polysaccharides. This is done by adjusting the time within the working zone by regulating an axial displacement of a nozzle which adjusts relative to the length of the chamber.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion in either of the references for combining the adjustable nozzle feature of the reference to Korene et al. with the reference to Klausen in order to regulate a residence time of a material along the length of the screw of the Klausen reference. Absent this suggestion, it is believed that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to make the combination and, in fact, the combination would require a structural modification to the Klausen reference.

It should be noted that the nozzle in the reference to Korene et al. moves generally axially relative to the housing and with respect to the outlet of the housing. In the reference to Klausen, the discharge is radially outwardly of the housing and a motor structure is provided at the end of the housing where any such nozzle, as taught by Korene et al., would have to be placed.

This is not functionally possible using the structure of Klausen.

To further differentiate the present invention, it should be noted that claim 1 has also been amended to state that the flange portion of the screw shaft, which cooperates with the throttle means of the present invention, extends transversely with respect to the screw shaft and such that the throttle means is spaced radially outwardly with respect thereto. This structure is not disclosed in either of the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the grounds for rejection is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the allowability of the claims, it is respectfully requested that a personal interview with the undersigned attorney-of-record be scheduled before taking any action which may be considered final.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, it is respectfully requested that he contact the undersigned attorney-of-record at the telephone number shown below for further expediting the prosecution of the application.

Appl. No. 09/666,326
Amndt. dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

DOWELL & DOWELL, P.C.

By 

Ralph A. Dowell, Reg. No. 26,868

Date: August 3, 2004

DOWELL & DOWELL, P.C.
Suite 309, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone - 703 415-2555
Facsimile - 703 415-2559
E-mail - dowell@dowellpc.com